

August 30, 1965

21303

Their contribution total was \$85,000. The Curtis Hotel received \$27,240 for office space; the Leamington Hotel received \$20,405 for office space; the Leamington Hotel also received for the rental of the Illinois and the Minnesota rooms \$4,800.

The cost of stationery was \$1,823. The cost of equipment rental was \$56. Personnel, salaries for typists, and other clerical help was \$27,077, and overtime paid for locally recruited help was \$3,600.

This made up the local contribution. It was willingly received.

As you know, the authorization was in the amount of \$400,000, but only \$320,000 was actually used. A little more than that was appropriated, but \$12,639 went back to the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the great city of Boston and the great State of Massachusetts will make the same kind of effort.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is unnecessary at this time, and I ask for the defeat of the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Gross: Page 2, line 5, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$400,000".

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the intent of my substitute amendment is to strike the language offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], that in order to qualify for this Federal money, the State of Massachusetts or the city of Boston, must make available \$100,000 from its own resources with which to defray the costs of this proposed assembly.

Mr. Chairman, it is my conviction that this is probably an undue restriction on the funds which we might make available under this resolution. It is certainly far more rigorous than was applied to the city of Minneapolis and the State of Minnesota.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do feel that to authorize \$400,000 rather than \$500,000 is not unreasonable.

I would point out that this is the same amount that was actually authorized when the assembly was held in Minneapolis in 1958, but actually only \$332,000 was appropriated, which means if we should appropriate the full amount to be authorized, the \$400,000, we will have an increase of \$68,000, or, roughly, 20 percent over what was made available as a Federal contribution in 1958. I am not sure how much costs have increased since that time. I would think that even with an increase from 85 to 125 countries participating in the assembly, there would not be so great an increase that it could not be absorbed by a \$400,000 figure.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this would be a reasonable compromise expressing our interest in securing the location of the assembly at Boston, Mass., and providing a reasonable amount of

Federal funds as a way of defraying the costs that will be quite obviously required, if we do not utilize the Geneva headquarters of this association.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate what the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey is doing with his substitute in striking out some of the restrictive language in the amendment, I must continue to oppose the proposed reduction in the amount of the authorization. The increase in the size of the World Health Organization, the normal increase in costs over the past 10 years, argue against such a reduction. Therefore, it seems to be the better part of wisdom to have an authorization at the \$500,000 figure.

Given the facts and knowledge we have of what was actually spent for the Minneapolis meeting, and given the facts we have available to us 10 years later, it would seem to me we have to stick to the \$500,000 authorization, and defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 403, pursuant to House Resolution 501, he reported the resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the resolution.

The resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 253 I was recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea," and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SALE OR LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 521 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 521

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7811) to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] for 1 hour.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] 30 minutes, and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 521 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 7811, a bill to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7811 would authorize the sale or loan of 12 vessels of the destroyer and submarine categories of the Reserve Fleet to certain friendly Latin American countries. This is to enable the Latin American navies to continue replacement of obsolete ships and standardization on general-purpose units suitable and effective for peacetime surveillance of coastal waters, support of counterinsurgency operations in coastal areas, and wartime patrol of convoy routes along their coasts.

The cost of this bill will be between \$38 and \$80 million depending upon the extent of overhaul and modification performed, and whether title to the ships is purchased by the recipient countries. This cost will be borne entirely by the recipient countries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 521.

August 30, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 521 will provide 1 hour of debate with an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 7811.

Immediately following this resolution, Mr. Speaker, we will have House Resolution 522, which provides for the consideration with 1 hour of open debate for H.R. 7812.

Immediately following that we will have another related item, House Resolution 523, with 1 hour of open debate for the consideration of H.R. 7813.

These bills are all out of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. Speaker, and they all apply to the same purpose.

In other words, the purpose of these bills is to make possible the further sale or loan of U.S. naval vessels to friendly countries. H.R. 7811 covers Latin America; H.R. 7812 covers Italy and Spain; H.R. 7813 covers China, Turkey, and the Philippines.

H.R. 7811 covers the following proposals: the loan or sale to Argentina of three destroyers; to Brazil of four destroyers; to Chile of two destroyers; to Peru of two destroyers; to Venezuela of one submarine. The cost of between \$38 to \$80 million will be borne by the recipients.

H.R. 7812 covers the following loans: to Italy of two submarines; to Spain of one helicopter carrier. The cost of \$20.5 million will be borne by the recipient.

H.R. 7813 covers the following loans: to China of one destroyer and two destroyer escorts; to Turkey of two destroyers; to the Philippines of one destroyer escort. The cost of \$17 to \$26 million will be borne by the recipients.

To date similar laws have authorized the loan of 94 ships, the transfer of 9 ships, and the sale of 4 ships. The ship loan laws have involved an expenditure of \$158,981,000. The United States has received \$41,406,345 from the sale of a submarine.

Mr. Speaker, there are no minority reports on these particular bills. I think they are out of the committee unanimously. I know of no objection to these rules, Mr. Speaker, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING LOAN OF VESSELS TO TURKEY, CHINA, AND THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 523, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 523

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], who has already explained this legislation, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 522 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 7812, a bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7812 would authorize the loan of two submarines to Italy and a helicopter carrier to Spain. The submarines to be loaned are of the *Balao* class—1,500 tons. The helicopter carrier is of the *Cabot* class—11,000 tons.

The cost of H.R. 7812 will be approximately \$20.5 million and will be borne entirely by the recipient countries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 522.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8333, TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROGRAM OF CASH AWARDS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 524, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 524

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8333) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements by members of the armed forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 524 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 8333, a bill to amend title 10, United

States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations.

No award of more than \$25,000 may be made under the bill, the same limitation as appears in the existing civilian program.

Military and civilian personnel often work side by side on similar jobs, entailing similar authority and responsibility. By law, the civilian may receive a sizable cash award from public funds for a sound idea or invention. The military member does not, but should have the same opportunity.

Prior to 1963, the Department of Defense was opposed to cash payments to service personnel for beneficial suggestions; however, recently the Department has reconsidered its position in the light of the success of the incentive pay program, which is now an integral part of the military pay structure, and the marked success of the suggestion programs of the Federal civil service and private industry. In view of this reconsideration, DOD has recognized the value of the proposed military incentive awards program and strongly favors this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 524.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 524 provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 6333.

This particular bill, as I understand it, will permit members of the armed services to participate in connection with awards when they make suggestions which may save the services some money.

This is similar to programs for other Government employees, who are permitted to participate in this way. It seems fair that this provision should apply to members of the armed services.

For any particular suggestion which is accepted, no matter how many persons participate, there is a maximum limit of \$25,000 on the amount which can be paid relative thereto.

We have had little experience with this particular program. It is more or less starting in this way, so there is no way to estimate what the total cost might be at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from California has said.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SALE OR LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I can up the om 2003/10/15

to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7811

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may sell or lend, at his discretion, to friendly foreign nations of Latin America from the reserve fleet, on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, destroyers and submarines as follows:

(1) Argentina, three destroyers, (2) Brazil four destroyers, (3) Chile, two destroyers, (4) Peru, two destroyers, (5) Venezuela, one submarine.

SEC. 2. All expenses involved in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting (including repairs, alterations, and logistic support) of vessels transferred under this Act shall be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the reimbursable provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding sections 7304 and 7305 of title 10, United States Code, should the President determine that the vessel or vessels shall be sold to the recipient government, said vessel or vessels shall be stricken from the Naval Vessel Register. The vessel or vessels shall be sold at not less than \$1,000,000 each over and above any cost of activation, overhaul, or modification. All sales will be made pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

SEC. 4. All loans executed under this Act shall be for periods not exceeding five years, but the President may in his discretion extend such loans for an additional period of not more than five years. They shall be made on the condition that they may be terminated at an earlier date if necessitated by the defense requirements of the United States.

SEC. 5. No sale or loan may be made under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such sale or loan is in the best interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all sales or loans made under authority of this Act.

SEC. 6. The President may promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. The authority of the President to sell or lend naval vessels under this Act terminates on December 31, 1967.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, we have for consideration today three very similar bills. I realize that they must be considered separately. But with your indulgence, I think they can best be dealt with if I make remarks at this time on all three of them.

All three bills relate to the lending of ships to friendly foreign nations. I will describe each of these bills briefly, but before I do that I think it might be helpful to refresh your memory as to why this legislation is necessary.

Prior to 1951, U.S. naval vessels were transferred to friendly foreign nations under the provisions of the Mutual Assistance Act of 1949, as amended. In 1951, the Congress passed Public Law 82-3 (10 U.S.C. 7307). This law, as codified, is as follows:

RESTRICTION ON DISPOSAL

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no battleship, aircraft carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine of the Navy may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of, unless the Chief of Naval Operations certifies that it is not essential to the defense of the United States.

(b) Without authority from Congress granted after March 10, 1951, no battleship, aircraft carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine that has not been stricken from the Naval Vessel Register under section 7304 of this title, nor any interest of the United States in such a vessel, may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of under any law.

Since that time, 17 laws relating to ship transfers have been enacted by the Congress. Eleven of these provided authority for new loans and extensions of existing loans, and the other six dealt with loan extensions only.

These laws have authorized the loan of 94 ships, the transfer of 9 ships, and the sale of 4 ships. Of the 94 ships authorized for loan, 72 have actually been loaned; of the 4 ships authorized for sale, 1 has been sold; all of the 9 ships' transfers have been effected.

To date, ship loan laws have involved an expenditure of \$158,981,000 in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting of vessels.

On the other side of the ledger, the United States has received \$41,406,345 from the sale of a submarine to Venezuela and from the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting of vessels which have been paid for by the recipient countries.

All of the ships in these bills are now in the Reserve Fleet—or as it is sometimes called—the mothball fleet. There is no intention at this time to use any of these ships in our own Active Navy, and the very best use to which they can be put is to place them in the hands of our friends and allies in order that they may perform naval functions that are both of benefit to the recipient country and a very considerable benefit to us.

As I am sure I do not need to tell you, our worldwide defense commitments have required—and still do require—large allocations of our resources of manpower, equipment, and money. It has been our constant goal to obtain a larger and more equitable allied participation in and contribution to free world development with a corresponding decrease in the burden of high costs which we now are bearing. The ships that will be loaned under the authority of these three bills will support this goal.

With but limited cost to the United States in men, money, and materials, certain ships now contributing only potential readiness in our Reserve Fleet, can be converted to actual operational naval strength in the hands of our allies.

These Reserve Fleet ships have a U.S. mobilization role; however, from a strictly military standpoint, they are, of course a much more valuable asset when over-

August 30, 1965

hauled and modernized to an appropriate degree, strategically dispersed throughout the world, and operational in the hands of our allies.

The military requirements for the loan of these ships has been thoroughly validated by the country team, the unified commander, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In every instance it has been determined that the recipient country has both the manpower and technical ability to operate the ships efficiently and effectively.

H.R. 7811

H.R. 7811, the first of these 3 bills, would authorize the loan of 12 vessels to the following South American countries: Argentina, 3 destroyers; Brazil, 4 destroyers; Chile, 2 destroyers; Peru, 2 destroyers; and Venezuela, 1 submarine.

I will draw your attention to the fact that a list of the ships now on loan to these countries appears on page 3 of the committee report.

H.R. 7811, then, would authorize the loan of 11 destroyers and 1 submarine. I want to point out that there are in the reserve fleet today 134 destroyers and 9 submarines.

The Department estimates that this bill will cost the countries concerned somewhere between \$38 and \$80 million. The actual cost depends on a number of things, such as the condition of the hull and machinery of the particular ships chosen for loan, the length of time since the ship was active, and the type of installed equipment, such as radars, radios, fire control equipment, and so forth.

Also, and this is true only with respect to H.R. 7811, the South American countries, under the wording of this bill, have the option to purchase any of these vessels. If a country does choose to buy a vessel, the cost to that country will be the total cost of the reactivation, overhaul and modernization, plus \$1 million.

I have stated that the estimated cost of this bill to the recipient countries will be between \$38 and \$80 million; an educated guess of the actual cost to them is \$68.68 million, and a breakdown of the cost of each country is set out in a readily understandable table on page 4 of the committee report.

I repeat that all costs for these ships will be borne by the individual recipient country.

H.R. 7812

I will now turn to H.R. 7812. Everything that I have said with respect to H.R. 7811 applies to this bill, too, with the single exception that no sales are contemplated.

This bill would authorize the loan of two submarines to Italy and one helicopter carrier to Spain.

The cost of this bill to Italy and Spain is estimated to be \$20.5 million. A breakdown of these costs appears on the second table on page 4 of the committee report, and a listing of the ships now on loan to Italy and Spain appears on the top table on that same page. Included in the \$20.5 million is the cost of 6 helicopters for the helicopter carrier. These helicopters are of the SH-3A type and carry the popular name of Sea King. Spain and Italy pay all the costs.

H.R. 7813

H.R. 7813 would authorize the loan of the following ships:

Republic of China, one destroyer and two destroyer escorts; Turkey, two destroyers; and the Philippines, one destroyer escort.

Most of the considerations which I have mentioned with respect to the other two bills apply equally to this bill.

Only loans—no sales—are contemplated by this bill.

You will recall that at the beginning of my statement I noted an important difference between H.R. 7813 and the other two bills. That difference is reflected in the language of the bill on page 2, lines 1 through 5. You will note that section 2 of H.R. 7811 and H.R. 7812 states that:

All expenses will *** be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the *** provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act.

In the case of H.R. 7813 that section reads:

All expenses shall be charged to funds programmed for the recipient government as grant military assistance or is reimbursable, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Under this language two courses of action are possible. First, if it is determined that the recipient countries are able to pay for the costs associated with these ships, then they will be required to pay these costs. However, if the countries are found to be unable to pay the costs, then the costs will be paid by the United States as grant military assistance.

In any event, the costs associated with the ships in this bill will total between \$17 million and \$26 million, but it is not possible to say at this time how much, if any, will be paid by the United States and how much by the recipient countries. Also, the question of the particular ships chosen, the condition of their hulls and machinery, and the amount of work which will be performed in the United States and the amount of work to be performed in the recipient country all will have a bearing on the actual cost. A breakdown of these costs appears on page 3 of the report. A list of the ships now on loan to these three countries also appears on page 3.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my statement on these three bills with the exception of these very important references:

First, these loans will be for a period of 5 years but extendable for an additional period of 5 years if the President determines that that is in our best interests.

Second, all ships can be recovered by the United States at any time if our defense requirements so require, and

Third, no loan may be made unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan is in the best interests of the United States.

As I have already stated, the passage of these three bills will, with very little, if any, cost to the United States, convert what is only potential readiness in our Reserve Fleet to actual operational naval strength in the hands of our friends.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the meaning of the language on page 10 of the report and which appears again on page 11 of the report where it says as follows:

The costs for activation and rehabilitation of the vessels will be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the reimbursable provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Does this mean that foreign aid money is being used, or what is the precise meaning of this language?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, these are merely the mechanics or the method whereby these countries reimburse our country in dollars for the purchase of materiel and the activation cost of these ship loans. However, there is a difference in H.R. 7813 which permits grant aid—in which case the cost would be borne by our taxpayers through the foreign aid program.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the question again? Are funds taken from military assistance in the foreign aid program used for this purpose?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Only in the case of H.R. 7813, relating to the ship loans to China, Turkey, and the Philippines—in which case it can either be reimbursable or grant aid.

Mr. GROSS. So that in any event the taxpayers of the United States pay for it, do they not?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes, it is quite possible that the cost of the ship loans to China, Turkey, and the Philippines will be borne by the United States.

Mr. GROSS. So the beneficiary countries do not pay, but we pay.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman further whether any of these so-called friendly foreign countries set forth in this bill—and, incidently, I guess the President makes the determination as to whether they are friendly or not, does he not?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Right here on page 8 of the report on this bill, H.R. 7811, is a definition of what a friendly nation is. This has to be determined by the President. There is no other way it may be done.

Mr. GROSS. Are any of these countries—Brazil, Chile, Peru, or Venezuela—presently expropriating American property and the investments of American businessmen? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I did not read the paper very fully this morning but I do not think as of today they have.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand why we would be giving them anything if they are expropriating, as most of them have been doing at one time or another, the property of our businessmen and investors.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I concur in what the gentleman says. I do not think this should be a practice. I

agree with what the gentleman says, and I think the House agrees with him, too.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to be certain that none of these countries are confiscating any property of American citizens and still getting a handout in the form of warships.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as I say, this bill H.R. 7811 would cost in the neighborhood of \$68 million. The cost will be borne by the recipient countries. I say the recipient countries may want to buy these ships in which case this may be done by the payment of an additional amount of \$1 million. This amount represents 10 percent of the original acquisition cost of these ships.

Mr. Speaker, let me make clear that we have no present need for these ships. They all come from the Reserve Fleet. They can only be properly and efficiently utilized after modernization along the lines of our FRAM program. If a friendly government gets one of these ships—and they are friendly as determined by the State Department, and the President of the United States—this activation and modernization will be effected and these ships will then further augment the free world's ability to counter any aggression.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GROSS. If the Congress is going to persist in this business of multibillion dollar, annual multibillion dollar foreign give-away programs, I suspect that the purpose for which this money will be spent is probably as good or better than most of the others. But I still come back to the question whether we are aiding and abetting countries which have no hesitancy in confiscating American property. I question under the friendliness of any of the country on this list if they permit American investors to come into those countries and then seize the investments.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, that as far as I can see this legislation will not strengthen our national security nor promote world peace. I am pleased to observe, however, that at least there are no Latin American countries named in this bill that have, like one South American country, seized our fishing boats. Ecuador, by claiming a territorial sea or fishing zone of 200 miles has used its navy to seize our fishing boats, fining them, and using that as a sort of international blackmail.

I am not going to actually oppose this bill. I just do not think it is going to do very much good, but perhaps it will not do much harm. If a few destroyers would be helpful in opposing Castro's Communist expansion, I would favor the bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Each of these recipient countries has been screened and approved by the country team in this country. Each of them must be approved by the Navy Department, State and Defense Departments.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I note that Brazil is on this list. The President of Brazil has taken a trip to Moscow recently or is due to go there soon. I am not sure how long Brazil will be friendly. I do not pretend to know myself what the situation is and whether or not these naval vessels might be used against us.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Understand, the President of the United States has to approve the transfer of each one of these vessels. Our passing these bills does not ipso facto transfer them to the recipient countries. Since 1951 we have prohibited the transfer of any combatant ship without a specific act of Congress. This would authorize the President, if he is satisfied with all these guarantees under all these guidelines, that the transfer of these ships under the restrictions that I have outlined would be proper.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to count on the President to decide what my responsibility is. That is my responsibility. Without additional testimony as to the need of this legislation to allow transfer of U.S. naval vessels to Latin American countries, I must vote against the bill.

Mr. Speaker, my responsibility is to either vote for or against this legislation. I am concerned that it is not good legislation and it is not in the best interests of the security of the United States. However, I am willing to at least admit that I believe there are others who know on that score better than I do.

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I am glad, at least, these ships are not going to a nation which has been seizing our fishing vessels. I am thankful for that.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has described what each of these three ship loan bills will do.

I would like to restrict my remarks to the more general picture of why it is in our own best interests to engage in a program of this kind.

First, I would like to stress that while the recipient foreign nations will receive some internal benefit by reason of having these ships in their possession, our own interest is in providing the whereabouts for friendly foreign nations to do jobs that have to be done and which in many instances we ourselves would have to perform if we did not loan these ships.

H.R. 7811

The first of these bills, H.R. 7811, proposes the loan or sale of 11 destroyers and 1 submarine to the South American countries enumerated by the chairman and set out in the bill itself. These loans will involve no cost to the United States and will provide a more effective and economical means by which our country can assist the South American navies to improve their forces.

Many of the naval ships now in the possession of South American countries are obsolete. These loans will permit the replacement of these obsolete ships.

and also permit a certain standardization between our country and the South American countries to the end that our common interests can be effectively carried out.

In large part, the loan of these ships to South America and to the other countries are for the purpose of coastal water surveillance. We all know how important that is today.

Our own naval forces, although very large, are simply not capable of assuming antisubmarine warfare roles in these areas throughout the world. The loans will permit our friends to do this for us and for themselves.

Some of us here on the floor today are aware that we have held some highly effective antisubmarine warfare training exercises with our South American friends. These exercises have clearly demonstrated the great value of standardizing equipment and training toward an improvement of our collective strength.

We passed a ship loan bill in 1958 which provided, among other things, for the loan of ships to South American countries. All or most of those countries immediately took action to scrap, lay up, or inactivate tonnage well beyond that received in the loans. It is safe to assume that the same action will be taken if this bill is passed. It is obvious that the only alternative would be a growing obsolescence of their ships, a degrading of the South American role, and the very real possibility of them turning to other countries for support.

H.R. 7812

Turning to H.R. 7812, this bill would authorize the loan of a helicopter carrier to Spain and two submarines to Italy.

Again, all of the costs involved will be borne by those two countries. Spain also will purchase six helicopters for use on the helicopter carrier. As the chairman pointed out, the only difference between this bill and that for South America is that only loans—no sales—are contemplated by H.R. 7812.

H.R. 7813

The third bill, H.R. 7813, would authorize a loan of three destroyers and three destroyer escorts to countries on the rim of the Communist world. These countries are Turkey, the Republic of China, and the Philippines.

This bill is somewhat different from the first two in that provision is made for the costs being borne by our own country if such appears to be necessary.

In my own opinion, it will be money well spent if that does turn out to be the case. I should point out, however, that prior to the allocating of grant aid in the case of H.R. 7813, a very close examination is made to see whether these three countries, China, Turkey, and the Philippines, can pay the bill. This is a detailed procedure and is not for a moment to be thought of as casual in any sense.

If they can pay, they have to pay. But pay or not, our best interests, as I have said, are served by placing these ships in the hands of our friends for the reasons I have referred to previously.

And that is the picture of this ship loan legislation. We will, as the chair-

August 30, 1965

man has stated so well, convert potential strength to actual strength by taking ships from the mothball fleet and putting them in operation.

It is not every piece of legislation about which it can be said that all interested parties will receive a benefit—I think that can be very accurately said about these three ship loan bills.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7811, which authorizes the sale or loan of naval vessels to several friendly Latin American nations. This legislation will allow the sale or loan of three destroyers to Argentina, four destroyers to Brazil, two destroyers to Chile, two destroyers to Peru, and one submarine to Venezuela.

The presence of a Communist base in the Caribbean, Mr. Speaker, has increased the need for additional naval surveillance by the nations of Central and South America. In addition, Russia has extended her submarine capability in recent years to the Western Hemisphere. During hearings on "Communism in Latin America," conducted last February by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, there was discussion concerning the increased difficulty of surveillance when the new Russian-built harbor facilities at Havana are completed.

Increasing amounts of the available capital of our Latin American allies are being allocated to increase the standard of living of their people and to curb spiraling inflationary trends. Consequently, many of our Latin American friends are unable to finance construction of new ships which they so vitally need to replace obsolete vessels. We have ships available in our reserve fleet that are not being used by the United States, and they can be modified or overhauled in a relatively short time. It is my understanding that the overhauling and modification work will be done in the United States and paid for by the recipient nations.

The sale or loan of these 11 ships to our South American sister republics will provide the most economical and practical means by which the United States can assist these navies in improving their effectiveness. Needless to say, increased naval strength of friendly Latin American countries means increased naval surveillance in the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, not only will the passage of H.R. 7811 be advantageous to the countries affected, but definite advantages will accrue to the United States as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the pending measure.

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that the ship loan program contemplated under this bill is in support of countries very close to those threatened with subversion by the Communist world, and is an essential security requirement for the United States. Al-

though these countries

ity to operate these ships, not all are able to pay the large-scale costs of modifications to any new ships or engage in a large modification program. It is for this reason that the United States is providing the ships on a loan basis in the interest not only of itself, but of our democratic allies in Latin America, all dedicated to combating communism near our borders.

It is not wise for us to be in a position where all Communist insurgencies or infiltrated war naval tasks throughout the world must be assumed by the United States. Every necessary task a friendly foreign navy undertakes, frees the United States from the obligation to provide for its accomplishment. Our ship loan program has shown excellent results in the past in this respect. The proposed loan or sale of ships to South American navies to support an antisubmarine warfare capability in the South Atlantic and South Pacific, represents a very modest investment as compared to what it would cost the United States to duplicate the effort. Navies of the four naval powers of South America which are involved have a high competence and a century-old tradition as deepwater sailors in which they take great pride. Personnel of these navies have today great admiration for our Navy and without exception are firm friends of the United States.

The proposed legislation supports U.S. policy, strengthens free world forces, enhances U.S. forward security, and improves the U.S. balance of payments. Most important it converts the potential of a portion of the Reserve Fleet to actual operating naval strength, strategically dispersed and operational in the hands of our allies at minimum cost to us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO ITALY AND SPAIN

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7812

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may lend to friendly foreign nations, on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, ships from the reserve fleet as follows:

(1) Italy, two submarines, and (2) Spain,

Sec. 2. All expenses involved in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting (including repairs, alterations, and logistic support) of vessels transferred under this Act shall be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the reimbursable provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

Sec. 3. All loans executed under this Act shall be for periods not exceeding five years, but the President may in his discretion extend such loans for an additional period of not more than five years. They shall be made on the condition that they may be terminated at an earlier date if necessitated by the defense requirements of the United States.

Sec. 4. No loan may be made under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

Sec. 5. The President may promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 6. The authority of the President to lend naval vessels under this Act terminates on December 31, 1967.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I am unable to understand why we should give anything to the Italians. It seems to me their economy is in pretty good shape. Why do we not sell these used submarines to the Italians instead of giving or loaning them? If they are loans, they are giveaways because we will never get them back.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, later on they may want to buy these ships. We are not putting out a nickel of our money.

Mr. GROSS. Why do we not just sell them now to the Italians—they have money?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The NATO team in Italy may recommend such a course. But I recall to the attention of the gentleman that we have no present need for these ships. Italy is going to recondition them and do all the necessary work and they are to be placed at the disposal of the NATO command.

Mr. GROSS. What are the Italians going to do with them?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They are going to use it.

Mr. GROSS. For what?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. For the NATO mission assigned to the navy of Italy.

Mr. GROSS. They would not man them and do something in our behalf; would they?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They are doing something in our behalf because it comes under our fleet command which is at the Mediterranean Headquarters and enables us to hold the fleet at the disposal of the NATO commander.

Mr. GROSS. How would it be to get a few of these people to whom we have

August 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

21309

been giving warships, to send a few regiments or battalions of troops out to Vietnam? Do you know of any Italians who are doing any fighting in Vietnam? I don't know of any.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It would suit me fine if you could get them to do it.

Mr. GROSS. Still we are giving them warships.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Italy is a very conscientious and a very responsible member of NATO. Italy is doing a magnificent job and the Italian navy is doing wonderful work there.

Mr. GROSS. They are not spilling any guts and blood in Vietnam; are they?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman must remember this. We have our 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and Italy is giving us help in logistics of all kinds of any part of NATO. If there is any country that has done more than Italy, I have not heard of it. I enthusiastically recommend that these ships go to these countries. Of course, Spain is not a member of NATO but I know of no better ally that we have than Spain.

Mr. GROSS. I thought we were talking about Italy.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Spain is included in this bill too.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I know it is.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I was just saying that Spain is not a part of NATO.

Mr. GROSS. I know that. But let me call your attention to what President Eisenhower said in his message to the Congress, dated March 13, 1959. He said:

As the result of our foreign aid—

And this is part of it—our friends among the free world nations make available to us 5 million ground forces, 30,000 aircraft, and 2,500 vessels.

So we continue to spread these vessels out around the world and yet we do not get a bit of help in Vietnam where the going is rough and tough and where Americans are dying every day. When are these people to whom we are giving all this assistance and relieving them so far as their economies are concerned—when are they going to do a little real helping out where it counts?

Where are the 5 million troops, the 30,000 aircraft, and the 2,500 vessels that Eisenhower claimed would be available to us in exchange for the billions in foreign aid for which Americans have been taxed? Or have we been duped again?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would suggest to the gentleman that this secures one of our vital flanks to have this flank of the American forces secure in Italy. Having this flank of our forces secure in this area enables us to do what we are doing in Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, if we pulled the 6th Fleet out of the Mediterranean, we would not depend for long upon the Italians or anybody else in that area to take care of the situation; would we?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We are not going to pull them out.

Mr. GROSS. What is that?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We are not going to pull them out.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure we are not—I hope we do not.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We are not going to pull them out.

Mr. GROSS. But I say we could not depend on the so-called allies in that area any more than we can depend upon them to help in Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am sure the gentleman understands that Italy is one of the great assets serving as a flank for the 6th Fleet.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, like the bill H.R. 7811, which was just passed, this bill also provides for the loan of vessels to friendly foreign countries.

Of course, there is always a doubt as to whether or not we are doing the wise thing and only the passage of time will determine that. Only time itself will ever tell that tale. But we do know this. We have hundreds of ships—134 destroyers at the present time in our reserve fleet throughout the country. As one visits the shipyards on the Atlantic coast and on the west coast, one can see these ships rusting away. It seems to me it is in our better interest if we can have these ships rehabilitated now so that if the time ever comes that they might be needed, they will be ready to be used rather than for us to have to wait for 6 months or 18 months or 2 years to have these ships repaired. Therefore, because of that reason I think as well as in the interest of having a force in being now, I believe this bill that is now pending before us should be passed.

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 7813) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7813

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may lend to friendly foreign nations, on such

terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, ships from the reserve fleet as follows: (1) China, one destroyed and two destroyer escorts. (2) Turkey, two destroyers, and (3) the Philippines, one destroyer escort.

Sec. 2. All expenses involved in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting (including repairs, alterations, and logistic support) of vessels transferred under this Act, shall be charged to funds programmed for the recipient government as grant military assistance, or as reimbursable, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

Sec. 3. Loans executed under this Act shall be for periods not exceeding five years, but the President may in his discretion extend such loans for an additional period of not more than five years. All loans shall be made on the condition that they may be terminated at an earlier date if necessitated by the defense requirements of the United States.

Sec. 4. No loan may be made under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all extensions or loans made under authority of this Act.

Sec. 5. The President may promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 6. The authority of the President to lend naval vessels under this Act terminates on December 31, 1967.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The supplying of these warships to Turkey is not going to result in an immediate call upon us by the Greeks, is it?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted the gentleman asked that question. The Greek Navy comes up to NATO standards. The Turkish Navy does not. This will bring the Turkish Navy up, so far as we know, to the standards applied by NATO.

Mr. GROSS. Under the present chaotic conditions in the Greek Government, I would hope they would not ask us now to bolster their military forces. As one Member of the House of Representatives, I would hesitate to do so at the present time, as much as I admire the Greek people.

What I see going on there now certainly does not make it appear as though they are going to arrive at a stable government in the near future.

If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to refer for a minute to giving away and providing military assistance all over the world and failing to get any real help from the so-called friendly nations in Vietnam and elsewhere. I also call the attention of the gentleman to late reports that the Russians are starting another buildup in Cuba. If it is true that they are again embarked on a buildup in Cuba, we have the right to expect something different from what we have had in the past from the so-called friendly nations.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is one of the reasons why we want to secure our flanks. This NATO flank must be secured.

21310

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- HOUSE

August 30, 1965

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the discussion and deliberations on this particular proposal, for the benefit of the House I should like to place in the Record certain additional data concerning the ship loan program and a summary of the loans contemplated under these bills.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary may be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The summary is as follows:

Ship loan bills -- Summary

Bill	Country	Destroyers	Submarines	Destroyer escort	Carrier	Overall cost (millions)
H.R. 7811 ¹	Argentina	3				\$17.28
	Brazil	4				23.04
	Chile	2				11.52
	Peru	2				11.52
	Venezuela		1			5.32
Subtotal		11	1			68.08
H.R. 7812	Italy		2			.56
	Spain				1	20.00
Subtotal			2		1	20.56
H.R. 7813 ²	China	1		2		11.74
	Turkey	2				11.52
	Philippines			1		2.90
Subtotal		3		3		26.16
Total		14	3	3	1	115.39

¹ These countries may purchase ships.

² These countries may receive grant aid to defray cost of activation.

PREVIOUS SHIP LOANS AND TRANSFERS SINCE 1951

Public Law 82-8, 10 U.S.C. 7307, requires: Congressional approval of loans and transfers of combatant ships (battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer (DE), and subs).

Small ships—no legislation required (auxiliaries, landing craft, may be transferred, etc., when Secretary of Defense determines excess to mobilization requirement).

For existing ship loans to designated countries, see committee report.

Since 1951, 17 laws relating to ship transfers.

Number authorizing loan	94
Executed	72
Number authorizing transfer	9
Executed	9
Number authorizing sale	4
Executed	1
Totals	107 82

Ships in reserve fleet of the type subject to these bills: H.R. 7811, 7812, 7813:

Destroyers	134
Destroyer escorts	191
Cabot class carriers	3
Submarines	9
Total	387

As of August 1965, the reserve fleet contained the following:

Battleships	4
Cruisers	25
Carriers	7
Destroyers	183
Submarines	9
Amphibious ships	78
Mine warfare ships	69
Patrol ships (this includes 134 DE type)	202
Auxiliary ships	60
Total	577

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, it had been our hope that this question of whether these recipient countries would pay for the rehabilitation of these ships or not would have been resolved by the time we had this matter under consideration here. Un-

fortunately, it was not possible. Whether we pay for it or whether these foreign countries pay for it, I truly believe it is in our national interest that this transaction take place.

I would also like to say there was not one single dissenting vote against this bill in our committee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on each of the bills just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CASH AWARDS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 8333) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8333

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1124. Cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements

"(a) The Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, may authorize the payment of a cash award to, and incur necessary expense for the honorary recognition of, a member of the armed forces under his jurisdiction who by his suggestion, invention, or scientific achievement contributes to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of operations or programs relating to the armed forces.

"(b) Whenever the President considers it desirable, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, are authorized to pay a cash award to, and incur necessary expense for the honorary recognition of, a member of the armed forces who by his suggestion, invention, or scientific achievement contributes to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of operations of the Government of the United States. Such award is in addition to any other award made to that member under subsection (a).

"(c) An award under this section may be paid notwithstanding the member's death or separation from the armed force concerned, but only if the suggestion, invention, or scientific achievement forming the basis for the award was made while he was on active duty.

"(d) A cash award under this section is in addition to the pay and allowances of the recipient. The acceptance of such an award shall constitute—

"(1) an agreement by the member that the use by the United States of any idea, method, or device for which the award is made may not be the basis of a claim against the United States by the member, his heirs, or assigns, or by any person whose claim is alleged to be derived through the member; and

"(2) a warranty by the member that he has not at the time of acceptance transferred, assigned, or otherwise divested himself of legal or equitable title in any property right residing in the idea, method, or device for which the award is made.

"(e) Awards to, and expenses for the honorary recognition of, members of the Armed Forces under this section may be paid from (1) the funds or appropriations available to the activity primarily benefiting, or (2) the several funds or appropriations of the various activities benefiting, as may be determined by the President for awards under subsection (b), and by the Secretary concerned for awards under subsection (a).

"(f) The total amount of the award, or awards, made under this section for a suggestion, invention, or scientific achievement may not exceed \$25,000, regardless of the number of persons who may be entitled to share therein.

"(g) Awards under this section shall be made under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury shall send to the President annually for transmittal to Congress a program report, with appropriate recommendations, on the awards program.

"(h) For the purposes of this section, a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or of the Public Health Service who is serving with an armed force shall be treated as if he were a member of that armed force."

Elementary and Secondary School Aid: By a record vote of 303 yeas to 37 nays the House passed H.R. 9022, to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874. Several committee amendments were adopted.

Pages 21278-21294

World Health Assembly: By a voice vote the House passed H.J. Res. 403, authorizing an appropriation to enable the U.S. to invite the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969. Rejected amendments that sought to reduce the appropriation from \$500,000 to \$400,000; and to require the city or State to make \$100,000 available for expenses of the assembly. H. Res. 501, the rule under which the legislation was considered, had been adopted earlier by a voice vote.

Pages 21295-21303

Naval Vessel Loans: By voice votes the House passed without amendment the following bills:

H.R. 7811, authorizing the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries. H. Res. 521, the rule under which the legislation was considered, had been adopted earlier by a voice vote.

Pages 21303-21304, 21305-21308

H.R. 7812, authorizing the loan of naval vessels to Italy and Spain. H. Res. 522, the rule making in order the consideration of the legislation, had been adopted earlier by a voice vote.

Pages 21304, 21308-21309

H.R. 7813, authorizing the loan of naval vessels to Turkey, China, and the Philippines. H. Res. 523, providing for the consideration of the legislation, had been adopted earlier by a voice vote.

Pages 21304, 21309-21310

Military Cash Awards: By a voice vote the House passed H.R. 8333, establishing a program of cash awards for members of the Armed Forces, with a committee amendment. H. Res. 524, the rule under which the legislation was considered, had been adopted earlier by a voice vote.

Pages 21304-21305, 21310-21314

Lobbyists: The compilation by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of all registrations and quarterly reports for the second quarter of 1965 filed by persons engaged in lobbying activities, appears in this issue of the Congressional Record.

Pages 21343-21373

Bills Referred: Three Senate-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees.

Page 21314

Record Vote: One record vote developed during the proceedings of the House and appears on page 21294.

Program for Tuesday: Adjourned at 3:55 p.m. until Tuesday, August 31, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon, when the

House will act on the conference report on H.R. 6927, to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development; and will consider the following bills:

H.R. 9042, to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Governments of Canada and the United States (3 hours of debate);

H.R. 3141, health professions educational assistance amendments of 1965 (2 hours of debate);

H.R. 3420, to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise (2 hours of debate); and

H.R. 5863, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation (2 hours of debate).

Committee Meetings

WATERSHED PROJECTS AND LAND CONSERVATION

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit held a hearing on watershed projects. Testimony was heard from Representatives Haley and Callan; and public witnesses.

The following two bills were also considered:

H.R. 3018, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization. Testimony was heard from Representative Sikes and a departmental witness.

H.R. 6575, to provide for additional measures and types of assistance for carrying out plans for land conservation and land utilization. Testimony was heard from Representative Olsen.

MILITARY REAL ESTATE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Real Estate met in executive session on various real estate projects and approved the following:

ARMY (Disposals):

No. 203A—Part of the former Montgomery Air Force Station, Ala.

No. 204A—Major portion of Lordstown Military Reservation, Ohio.

No. 205A—Nike Battery N-36, Norfolk Defense Area.

No. 207A—Sioux Army Depot, Nebr.

No. 209A—Portion of New Orleans Army Terminal.

No. 210—Eric Army Depot, Ohio.

AIR FORCE (Disposals):

No. 164A—Hunter Air Force Base, Ga.

No. 166A—Olmsted Air Force Base, Pa.

BANK MERGER ACT

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee on Domestic Finance continued hearings on S. 1698,

Gilbert Stamm, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, who was accompanied by his associates.

INDIANS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: On Friday, August 27, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs held hearings on S. 2196, to authorize additional moneys for the Indian revolving loan fund, and S. 2197, providing for the guarantee and insurance of loans to Indians and Indian organizations, with testimony from Harry Anderson, Assistant Secretary for Public Lands, Philleo Nash, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and other officials of the Department of the Interior.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

RIGHT TO WORK

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: On Friday, August 27, committee continued its executive consideration of H.R. 77, repealing the right-to-work provisions (sec. 14(b)) of the National Labor Relations Act, and proposed amendments thereto, but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again on Wednesday, September 1.

Committee announced that it will vote on reporting this bill to the Senate by Thursday, September 2, at the latest; that the minority would have 1 week to prepare its views on this legislation; and that if approved by the committee the bill will be reported to the Senate by Wednesday or Thursday, September 8 or 9.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: On Friday, August 27, the Education Subcommittee, in executive session, approved for full committee consideration with amendments S. 600, proposed Higher Education Act of 1965.

The full committee will meet in executive session tomorrow to consider this and other pending bills.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Committee resumed its hearings on proposed Federal employees' salary legislation, with testimony from Nathan T. Wolkomin, National Federation of Federal Employees; Russell Stevens, American Federation of Technical Engineers; John P. Snyder, National Association of Postmasters; Fred J. O'Dwyer, who was accompanied by Donald Ledbetter and Daniel Jaspau, all of the National Association of Postal Supervisors; and Sidney A. Goodman, who was accompanied by David Silvergied, both of the National Postal Union.

On Friday, August 27, committee received testimony on this proposed legislation from E. C. Hallbeck and Patrick J. Nilan, both of the United Federation of Postal Clerks; John Griner and George Meagher, both of the American Federation of Government Employees; Lewis P. McCann, Vincent E. Jay, and Robert Ramspeck, all of the Federal Professional Association; and John G. Brady, National Association of Internal Revenue Employees.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 10733-10756; 5 private bills, H.R. 10757-10761; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 644, H. Con. Res. 466, and H. Res. 552-553, were introduced.

Page 21342

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 548, open rule providing for the consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H.R. 3420, the State Technical Services Act, filed on August 26 (H. Rept. 885);

H. Res. 549, open rule providing for the consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H.R. 5863, regarding rapid transit—ground speed, filed on August 26 (H. Rept. 886);

H. Res. 550, open rule providing for the consideration of and 1 hour of debate on H.R. 4845, regarding automatic data processing equipment, filed on August 26 (H. Rept. 887);

H. Res. 551, providing for the consideration of, 3 hours of debate on, and waiving points of order against H. Res. 548, filed on August 26 (H. Rept. 888);

and Canada concerning automotive products, filed on August 26 (H. Rept. 888);

H.R. 5664, providing for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians (H. Rept. 889);

H.R. 3715, to provide for the assessing of Indian trust and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington (H. Rept. 890); and

H.R. 8917, providing for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, amended (H. Rept. 891).

Pages 21161, 21341-21342

Defense Appropriations: The House disagreed to Senate amendments on H.R. 9221, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; agreed to a conference requested by the Senate; and appointed as conferees Representatives Mahon, Sikes, Whitten, Flood, Thomas, McFall, and Bow.

Page 21275